

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

- Claims 1-15 and 17-18 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-18 are rejected by the Examiner.
- Claims 1, 8, 13, 18-20 are amended.

### **Telephone Interview**

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the interview held on January 8, 2008. during that interview, proposed claim amendments were discussed. It was agreed that a claim amendment that overcomes the expansion widget of the tree structure on the left hand side of Figure 6A of Gomes would be helpful. Applicants' representative includes that and other clarifying amendments in the present claims.

### **Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action dated 11/01/2007 indicates on page 8 that the term "related" is defined as "connected by reason of an established or discoverable relation". The Office Action indicates that 'the sub-item of prior art formats the item value" is indicative of a "related" sub-item. Applicant respectfully disagrees but amends independent Claim 1 to include the aspect that the relationship between the first item value and the first sub-item value is a parent to child relationship. Claims 8, 13, and 18 are likewise amended. The amendment finds support in the as-filed specification on 0024 and 0044.

Claim 1, 8, 13, and 18 are further amended to include the aspects that the first item window displays an expansion widget indication that there are sub-items available for display. These expansion widgets may also be found in a sub-item window as well. The windows are displayed as overlaying a listing of the program under development. This amendment finds support in the as-filed specification in paragraphs 0042-0044 and the displays of Figures 3-5, and 7. By way of non-limiting example, Figure 5 of the as-filed specification shows an item window as item 310 which includes the expansion widget in the

left-most portion of the window 310. The sub-item window is item 430 which can contain multiple expansion widgets (see item 510). It is noted that both the item window 310 and the sub-item window 430 overlay the listing of program code under development on the display window containing the listing 210.

Claims 19 and 20 are amended to indicate that the value itself of the sub-item is edited as indicated in Figure 8 of the as-filed specification and the associated description.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-15, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0028107 to Gomes et al. (Gomes). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant notes that Gomes, in Figures 6A, 6B, and 6C fails to show many aspects of the presently claimed invention. For example, Gomes fails to show any expansion widgets as recited by the currently amended claims and as described in the as-filed specification. Gomes also fails to show a first window having a first item and a sub-item window having a first sub-item where the item and sub-item have a parent and child relationship. Gomes also fails to show the simultaneous occurrence of these aspects. That is, Gomes fails to disclose a single display showing the following:

1. a first window having a first item and an expansion widget indication,
2. a first sub-item window having a first sub-item,
3. the first window and the first sub-item window displayed overlaying a listing of a program under development, and
4. the relationship between the first item and the first sub-item is a parent and child relationship.

Gomes at paragraph 0013 teaches the display of a value of the expression in a specified format. As shown in Figure 6A of Gomes, the editable (bolded) portion of the “string” display does not display a “parent and child related” sub-item as recited in the pending independent claims. Although Figure 6A of Gomes allows editing of a tooltip as described in paragraph 0114, there is no discussion in Gomes of sub-item window displays simultaneous with the first item window displays as overlaying the listing of the program under development as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 13. Gomes also fails to teach

editing of the actual value of the displayed *sub-items* as recited in amended Claims 19 and 20. Gomes merely teaches changing the format of an item, not an edit of the value of the sub-item.

Since Gomes fails to teach all elements of Claims 1-15 and 17-20, then Gomes cannot anticipate the pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of the pending claims.

**Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 5, 11, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0028107 to Gomes et al. (Gomes) in view of Applicant provided document, “Microsoft, Tiptoe Through the ToolTips With Our All-Encompassing Tool Tip Programmer’s Guide” (Microsoft TipToe Through). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 5 is dependent on independent Claim 1, Claims 11 and 12 are dependent on independent Claim 8, and Clam 17 is dependent on independent Claim 13. Independent Claims 1, 8, and 13 patentably define over Gomes as described above. “Microsoft TipToe Through” also fails to teach the display of an item and a parent and child related sub-item as recited in the pending claims. Accordingly, the combination of Gomes and “Microsoft TipToe Through” fails to teach all of the elements of the independent claims. Applicant submits that the stated combination cannot render obvious the pending claims under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03 because all elements are not found in the combination of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of Claims 5, 11, 12, and 17.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2789/303543.01  
**Application No.:** 10/723,824  
**Office Action Dated:** November 1, 2007

**PATENT**

**Conclusion**

In view of the above arguments and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and requests reconsideration because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if any questions arise.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2008

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

---

Jerome G. Schaefer  
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439